DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 368 HE 019 867

AUTHOR Boice, Robert; Kelly, Kelly A.
TITLE Writing Viewed by Two Traditionally Disenfranchised Groups of Academicians, Women and Women's College Faculty.
PUB DATE [86]
NOTE 17p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; Editing; *Faculty Publishing; Faculty Workload; Females; Higher Education; *Males; Publish or Perish Issue; Rewards; Scholarship; Self Esteem; *Teacher Attitudes; *Women Faculty; *Writing for Publication

ABSTRACT

Views of women and men faculty at universities and women's colleges were surveyed concerning work loads, pressures to publish, experiences with the editorial process, and beliefs that scholarly writing will be rewarded. The Writing Survey was mailed to matched-pair samples of psychologists who were listed at academic settings in 1984. Of the 174 psychologists, usable questionnaires were received from 80 women and 83 men at doctoral-level universities and 13 women and 21 men at traditionally women's colleges. Responses indicated that: (1) at universities or colleges, women equal their male colleagues' time investments in writing and males' rates of publishing journal articles; (2) at women's colleges, men and women devote about half as much time to writing, devote about twice as much time to teaching, and publish articles at half the rate of their university counterparts; and (3) in either setting, women experience more discomfort about pressures to publish, feel more adversely affected by harsh reviewers, and report less confidence with their writing than do men, especially men at universities. (Author/SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED276368

Title: Writing Viewed by Two Traditionally Disenfranchised Groups of Academicians, Women and Women's College Faculty

Authors: Robert Boice & Kelly A. Kelly

Affiliation: Center for Faculty Development
California State University, Long Beach

Mailing Address: Center for Faculty Development
California State University, Long Beach
Long Beach, California 90840

Phone: (213) 498-5287

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert Boice

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 019 867

Abstract

Writing Viewed by Two Traditionally Disenfranchised Groups of Academicians, Women and Women's College Faculty

Matched-pair samples (N = 174) of women and men faculty at doctoral-level universities and at traditionally women's colleges responded to a questionnaire in ways indicating: a) that at universities or colleges, women equal their male colleagues' time investments in writing and males' rates of publishing journal articles; b) that at women's colleges, men and women devote about half as much time to writing, devote about twice as much time to teaching, and publish articles at half the rate of their university counterparts; c) that in either setting, women experience more discomfort about pressures to publish, feel more adversely affected by harsh reviewers, and report less confidence with their writing than do men, especially men at universities.

Writing Viewed by Two Traditionally Disenfranchised Groups of Academicians, Women and Women's College Faculty

If given the devilish assignment of transforming budding writers into probable failures, two directives might come to mind: Make them into women. Better yet, make them into women on the faculty of women's colleges.

Women seem ideal candidates for exclusion from the "old-boy" networks and "invisible colleges" that encourage writing for publication (Helmreich, Spence, Beane, Lucker, & Matthews, 1980). Women at traditionally women's colleges seem even more likely for exclusion; they work, presumably, with heavy teaching loads and with colleagues already disenfranchised from most power structures in academe. How better, then, to produce the shortages of time for writing (Boice & Jones, 1984) and the subtle discouragements (Gornick, 1983) that will ensure failure . . . or at least silence (Olsen, 1979)?

This study surveyed women at universities and at traditionally women's colleges, to check these assertions. We asked them (and a matched sample of male colleagues) about work loads, pressures to publish, experiences with the editorial process, and beliefs that scholarly writing will be rewarded. The results suggest that while the devil may have his/her due, women in both academic settings are competing successfully.

Method

We mailed a two-page (21-item) questionnaire ("Writing Survey") to 174 matched male-female pairs of psychologists listed at academic settings in the 1984 Directory of the American Psychological Association.

We based our sampling procedure around three notions: 1) distributing the matched pairs across the four major geographical areas of the United States, 2) distributing the matched pairs above and below an arbitrary measure of "youth" at 3-11 years post-Ph.D. (cf. 12-12+ years), and 3) beginning with a university or college listing for a woman faculty member and then selecting a male colleague most like her in terms of age and professional specialization.

The resulting sample of 354 psychologists included 25 pairs of faculty at 14 traditionally women's colleges (e.g., Mills, Wellesley) and 152 pairs at 14 doctoral-granting universities (e.g., University of Michigan, Duke). We chose psychologists as representative of other faculty groups because of practical considerations in getting stratified samples across multiple disciplines.

Return rates for completed and usable questionnaires (spring and summer, 1984): 80 women and 83 men at universities (54% of 304) 13 women and 21 men at colleges (68% of 50). Although questionnaires were returned anonymously, separate postcards reporting participation indicated that our sample was evenly distributed across geographic areas. Respondents indicated an

equivalent distribution of ages (group $\bar{X}$s ranged from 42.6 - 44.0 years).

Results and Discussion

Work Loads

Table 1 shows respondents' estimates of how much time they invested in a typical academic week. Overall, these college and university faculty evidently worked similarly long weeks, of about 52 hours, at a level comparable to that of other faculty surveys (Boice & Johnson, 1984; Hartley & Knapper, 1984)

Insert Table 1 About Here

Work estimates for men and women were nearly identical within each setting (Table 1). In a sense, this result contradicts the impression (e.g., Cole, 1979) that women in academe tend to invest less in their work or in aspects related to research and writing. To the extent, however, that earlier work (e.g., Astin & Bayer, 1979) reflected a higher proportion of women in colleges than in universities, this result provides some clarification. Women and men at these colleges spent nearly twice as much time in teaching and about half as much time researching and writing than their university counter-parts. Within the two settings, women appeared to make the same work investments as men.

The different teaching loads at colleges and universities may be related to the differences in the reported publication rates of their faculty (Table 2). These university faculty published

---

Insert Table 2 About Here

---

journal articles at a rate double that reported by college faculty; the difference for books/monographs was even greater.

Table 2, however, indicates two unexpected results. First, neither group of faculty matched the outdated but oft-repeated assumption that most academicians never publish (e.g., Guyer & Fidell, 1973). Less than five percent of either sample reported no recent publications. The mean of over an article a year for college faculty matches contemporary expectations for many university faculty (Boice & Jones, 1984). Second, women reported published articles at a rate equivalent to men. Previous reports (e.g., Bayer & Astin, 1975); Emmons, 1982) have almost uniformly concluded that men show higher publication rates.

Even with that apparent success, women may be paying a greater psychological price. Table 3 shows the result of asking

---

Insert Table 3 About Here

---

these faculty about perceived pressures to publish. Women, in colleges or universities, felt more personal pressure compared to men (35% vs. 16%, respectively). The same relationship held for perceptions of an overemphasis on publishing in academe (26% vs. 11%).

College faculty, similarly, reported much more discomfort than did university faculty with expectations about writing for publication (Table 3). The casual comments of college faculty

indicated that this emphasis is rather new and unwelcome on their campuses; colleges seem to be adopting the standards and inflationary guidelines of universities.

If women and women's college faculty tend to feel overly pressured, how does that feeling relate to experiences with the editorial process? An equivalent minority (range = 26 - 34%) in all four groups reported general experiences with reviewers and editors who were unjustly harsh, contradicting other, more critical accounts of peer reviewing (Bradley, 1981; Peters & Ceci, 1982). But when asked if reviewers tended to be insulting/condescending, only around 24% of these faculty agreed strongly. In other research where trained observers have rated the actual comments of peer reviewers, the incidence of inappropriateness among reviewers in psychology journals was surprisingly minor (Boice, Johnson, Klosko, & Barlow, 1984).

Given that the aversiveness of the editorial process may not be deterring women and women's college faculty to a large degree, what causes the discomfort? Some resentment might owe to perceptions that women are inequitably represented amongst reviewers and editors: Women at colleges and at universities (50% and 40%) were far more likely than men (5% and 15%, respectively) to rate the arrangement as unfair. When asked to indicate unquestioned beliefs that the same manuscript with a man's name as author would fare better with editors, only university men broke the pattern; one percent of them (cf. about 10% of the other three groups) agreed.

Another indication of how the editorial process, even if it doesn't deter them, can discourage writers appears in Table 4. Far

---

Insert Table 4 About Here

---

fewer women (7%) than men (24%) reported success in ignoring the harshest review they had ever gotten. And slightly more women (28%) than men (20%) recalled having abandoned that manuscript as a result.

But, as before, the college-university dimension remains critical (Table 4); college faculty fared worse, overall, in response to harshness than did university women. At universities, but not at colleges, women were no more likely to have given up than their male colleagues. Similarly, other questions revealed equally positive attitudes about the helpfulness of even the harshest reviewers ($\bar{X}$ = 0% for colleges, 9% for universities), but little difference for men and women.

Table 5, finally, suggests one dimension wherein university males may exhibit a slight advantage over university females in regard to behaviors and attitudes regarding scholarly writing. Only university males break the patterns relating to confidence with a

---

Insert Table 5 About Here

---

final draft and an absence of anxiety about writing. In this, and in related measures, they seemed far and away most confident, almost arrogant.

To an extent, the seeming arrogance of university males may be adaptive; recall that they were least likely to feel pressured about writing (Table 3), even though they work at and publish at rates

similar to their women colleagues in universities. But, that same male confidence may mean a lowered interpersonal orientation (Helmreich, Spence, Beane, Lucker, & Matthews, 1980).

Therein lies an interesting quandary. What price will formerly disenfranchised academicians pay as they match or approach the publication rates of university male faculty? On one hand, it seems that the liberal and sociable orientation that characterizes good teachers, but not good researchers (Rushton, Murray, & Paunonen, 1983), might fall prey to evolutionary selection.

But, on the other hand, an argument can be made against prejudgment. Women and women's college faculty do, after all, need and deserve representation in our scholarly journals (Boice & Jones, 1984). They already exceed the expectations of their more enfranchised colleagues and, perhaps, of their kindred co-workers who expressed doubts about how thoroughly male dominance could be broken (e.g., Kramerae, 1980; Spender, 1981). We can hope, then, that women and women's college faculty will provide other pleasant surprises. Why not suppose that they will excel where university men have not--at incorporating higher interpersonal orientations and broader appreciation of activities like teaching into productive, successful careers?

The questions that remain, though, concern the price. Will women faculty and women's college faculty continue to report a greater discomfort with the pressures of publishing? Or will they help transform, in non-devilish fashion, the publication process into something more humane?

References

Astin, H., & Bayer, A. E. (1979). Pervasive sex differences in the academic reward system: Scholarship, marriage, and what else? In D. R. Lewis & W. E. Becker (Eds.), Academic rewards in higher education. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Boice, R., Barlow, D. H., Johnson, K., & Klosko, J. (1984). Behaviorists as peer reviewers: Do they misbehave? Behavior Therapist, 7, 105-107.

Boice, R., & Johnson, K. (1984). Perception and practice of writing for publication at a doctoral-granting university. Research in Higher Education, 21, 33-43.

Boice, R., & Jones, F. (1984). Why academicians don't write. Journal of Higher Education, 55, 567-582.

Bradley, J. V. (1981). Pernicious publication practices. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 18, 31-34.

Cole, J. R. (1979). Fair science. New York: Free Press.

Emmons, C. (1982). A longitudinal study of the careers of a cohort of assistant professors in psychology. American Psychologist, 37, 1228-1238.

Gornick, V. (1983). Women in science. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Guyer, L, & Fidell, L. (1973). Publications of men and women psychologists: Do women publish less? American Psychologist, 28, 157-160.

Hartley, J., & Knapper, C. K. (1984). Academics and their writing. Studies in Higher Education, 9, 151-167.

Helmreich, R. L., Spence, J. T., Beane, W. E., Lucker, G. W., & Matthews, K. A. (1980). Making it in academic psychology: Demographic and personality correlates of attainment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 896-908.

Kramerae, C. (1980). Proprietors of language. In S. McConnell-Ginet, R. Barker, & N. Furman (Eds.), Women and language in literature and society. New York: Praeger.

Olsen, T. (1979). One out of twelve women who are writers in our century. In S. Ruddick & P. Daniels (Eds.), Working it out. New York: Pantheon.

Peters, D. P., & Ceci, S. J. (1982). Peer-review practices of psychological journals: The fate of published articles, submitted again. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 5, 189-195.

Rushton, J. P., Murray, H. G., & Paunonen, S. V. (1983). Personality, research creativity, and teaching effectiveness in universities. Scientometrics, 5, 93-116.

Spender, D. (1981). The gatekeepers: A feminist critique of academic publishing. In H. Roberts (Ed.), Doing feminist research. London: Kegan Paul.

Table 1

Estimates of Faculty's Time (Hours) Allotment

in a Typical Academic Week (1984)

	Hrs Schol Writ College	Univ	Hrs Re Tching College	Univ	Hrs Research Coll.	Univ.	Total Hrs Coll.	Univ.
Women	3.2	7.2	21.0	12.6	7.4	12.0	51.2	52.6
Men	2.8	7.8	20.2	12.8	6.6	12.3	51.9	53.1
$\bar{X}$	3.0	7.5	20.6	12.7	7.0	12.2	51.6	52.9

Table 2

Reported Publication Rates of College and University Faculty During the Last Three Years

	Journal Articles		Books/Monographs	
	College	Univ.	College	Univ.
Women	3.8	7.3	0.15	0.43
Men	3.5	7.9	0.05	0.72
$\bar{X}$	3.7	7.6	0.10	0.58

Table 3

Faculty Whose Perception of Pressures to Publish Reached the Level of Resentment and Who Perceived Too Much Emphasis on Publication in Psychology Overall

	Pressure on Self		Pressure on Psychologists	
	College	Univ.	College	Univ.
Women	50%	19%	39%	14%
Men	22%	10%	14%	7%
$\bar{X}$	36%	15%	27%	11%

Table 4

Faculty Affected by Their Harshest Review

	Successfully Ignored It		Gave Up on the Ms.	
	College	Univ.	College	Univ.
Women	0%	13%	40%	16%
Men	19%	27%	25%	15%
$\bar{X}$	10%	20%	33%	16%

Table 5

Faculty Indicating Extreme Satisfaction or Discomfort With Own Writing

	Fully Satisfied with Final Draft		Anxious About Writing	
	College	Univ.	College	Univ.
Women	0%	0%	8%	9%
Men	0%	5%	10%	4%